REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 28, 2006, claims 18-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101; claims 1-4, 10-14 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thurott (Windows Media Player 7 reviewed, 15 August 2000) in view of Cowart et al. (Special Edition Using Microsoft Windows XP Professional Que, 4 December 2001); claims 5-8, 15, 16 and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thurott and Cowart et al. in view of Hikida (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,737); claims 9, 17 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thurott in view of Cowart et al. and further in view of Hikida and Levy (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0033844). The foregoing rejections are respectfully traversed.

Minor amendments have been made to independent claims 1, 10 and 18-26 to further clarify the present invention.

Claims 1-26 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

Regarding the 101 rejections:

Claims 18-26 have been amended to recite "a computer-readable medium". Therefore, withdrawal of the 101 rejections is respectfully rejected.

Regarding the 103 rejections:

Neither of the foregoing references relied upon, individually or combined, discuss "an integrated management method for multimedia contents integratedly managing a plurality of multimedia players to replay multimedia files, comprising: activating a file search window in which a list of different types of multimedia files is displayed, and a file information registration window in which a list of file information of the different types of multimedia files is displayed, the file information for the different types of multimedia files being registered in a file information database (DB); and registering the file information of the different types of multimedia files in the file information DB by dragging and dropping the multimedia files displayed in the file search window to the file information registration window," as recited in claim 1, for example. Claims 10 and 18 recites features somewhat similar to those recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, the comments mentioned below may also be applied to overcome the rejections of claims 10 and 18.

Thurott merely discusses a Windows Media Player 7 (WMP7). Thurott merely discusses that **a Media Guide which is a web page with links to streaming and downloadable digital media** (see FIG. 1). Further, Thurott discusses "burning CDs and internet radio to connect to radio sites all over the world". Thurott states that the WMP7 Media Library organizes and plays

back digital audio such as music and video.

Thurott fails to discuss "...**registering the file information of the different types of multimedia files...**" as recited in claim 1, for example. Further, Thurott also mentions that WMP7 is not recommended as a one-stop solution for all your digital media needs (see paragraph 2 on page 1).

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Cowart et al. makes up for the deficiencies of Thurott. The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner.

In contrast, Cowart et al. discusses a windows media player which can be used to play music and video files from online sources and local drives and to create digitized version of music CDs (see page 2, for example). At page 7 of Cowart et al., as pointed out by the Examiner, Cowart et al. discusses an indexing service of Windows XP (i.e., a text-search system) that scans files and folders on your hard disk and builds a database of the words it finds in them in order to help speed p the search for files and directors option when your looking for words within files or keywords in file descriptions and to help the Internet information services Web server perform Web site searches. The indexing service of Cowart et al. is not comparable to "activating a file search window in which a list of different types of multimedia files is displayed..." recited in claim 1, for example.

Hikida discusses a data management apparatus for managing data created by application software programs (see Abstract). At page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that FIG. 26 of Hikida discusses "displaying an error message when one of the multimedia files that is dragged and dropped in the activated registration window according to contents does not have a file type that is able to be registered in the activated registration windows according to contents" as recited in claim 5, for example. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

In contrast, FIG. 26 of Hikida merely discusses that if it is determined based on acquired object management information (see step S11) that a copy source data is a disclosure objected and a disclosure copy limitation is set, a message indicating that the copy operation of the data is prohibited is displayed (see step S12). The disclosure copy limitation 128 is merely a setting content for limiting a copy operation of the object with respect to the disclosure target user (see column 12, lines 20-22). That is, the copy limitation is based upon the disclosure target user and whether or not the target user has access to copy this object. It is not based upon "a file type". The Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Hikida are fundamentally different from that of Thurott and Cowart et al. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine Hikida with these references.

8

Further, Levy discusses a method of connecting multimedia content to a network resource (see paragraph [0010]). The method extracts an indentifier from a media signal, it then sends the identifier to a network along with context information indicating device type information. From the network, the method receives related data associated with the media signal via the identifier. The related data is adapted to the network connecting device based on the device type information (see FIGS. 2 and 5, for example).

The Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine these references. Therefore, the Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions of obviousness mentioned at pages 4-9 of the Office Action.

Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of these references fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the present invention.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Deidre M. Davis/

Date: ___March 28, 2007___   By: _____
                                   Deidre M. Davis
                                   Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501